

1 reapportionment can well testify to.

2           The whole thrust of the argument which the  
3 sponsors of the amendment would make to you is this, that  
4 there is only one official figure for population and  
5 that is the Federal census figures.

6           I submit to you that that is not the case. I  
7 submit to you that in providing that interpretation that  
8 you have been misled, that letters to the editor of the  
9 New York Times notwithstanding and interpretations of the  
10 Washington Post notwithstanding, that the Supreme Court  
11 of the United States has indicated that there are other  
12 avenues to obtain official figures of population other  
13 than the Federal census and I will discuss the case of  
14 Rhodes v. Ohio and the language actually used rather than  
15 a newspaper interpretation, but I want to make it perfectly  
16 clear that when the Legislature reapportioned in 1966 that  
17 it presented the most miserable yet legal collection of  
18 approach to this problem that you can have.

19           In reality, the Legislature passed two bills,  
20 Senate Bill 5 and Senate Bill 8. One of them was so  
21 obviously so unconstitutional that the Court of Appeals  
had no problem and it looked at the other and it said